

## **Summary of Strategic Planning Meeting May 24, 2007 Core Curriculum and Expansion Committee**

The Committee met on 5-24-07 to obtain feedback for DES and the Interagency Council on Long-Term Care on the progress and direction of the curriculum implementation and to develop recommendations on three topics:

1. Direction on the ongoing implementation of the curriculum
2. Objectives for 2007-08, including funding priorities
3. Structure and role of the Committee going forward

Thirty-five individuals attended representing public agencies, providers, advocacy groups, and educational institutions. A list of attendees and organizations represented is attached.

This document summarizes the discussion and attempts to capture key issues and varying points-of-view. Comments are organized by topic and may at times reflect the views of some individuals but not others. The recommendations indicate the directions that emerged from the discussions and will need to be fleshed out in subcommittees.

### Preliminary feedback:

- More than the curriculum is at issue; a public policy plan is needed to maintain a professional, competent workforce that will meet future demand.
- Cost was mentioned as an issue for some providers. Not all providers feel that they can afford to pay employees for a large number of hours of training.
- Flexibility is needed in the curriculum implementation process to accommodate differing circumstances, for example, new employees vs. individuals already in the workforce as well as some employers having to comply with a variety of regulations.
- Competencies can be defined based on the curriculum, allowing providers to develop training programs to fit their needs while adhering to uniform competencies.
- The Committee confirmed that numerous terms are used to describe the direct care workforce and that it was not productive to pick one label over another. Most common are “caregiver” for individuals working with the elderly or physically disabled and “direct support professional” for those working with individuals with developmental disabilities.
- There is an insufficient labor pool, and there may not be enough trainers.

## **I. Project Status and Implementation Strategies**

### *A. Purpose and target for the proposed training*

- The curriculum was primarily intended for paid individuals providing in-home services.
- Competencies may need to be delineated by target population, since certain subgroups have unique requirements, for example requirements from the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD). However, it is important for different areas (aging, developmental disabilities, physical disabilities) to work together, to prevent workers

from leaving employment in areas perceived to have more regulations or training requirements.

- The question was raised whether the government has the right to impose specific training on family caregivers. This needs to be considered as consumer-directed care models are developed.
- Financial incentives for implementing training and competencies need to be explored.
- AHCCCS and DES-DAAS expressed an interest in studying the possibility of including training requirements in their contracts.
- The curriculum and any related requirements should be phased in, so that eventually all paid and unpaid providers of direct care and direct support services are included.

*Recommendation 1:* The direct care worker training process should initially focus on employees of state-funded agencies providing in-home services. This should include both new and existing employees. The group estimated this would represent over half, perhaps as much as 70% of the direct care and direct support workforce providing home-and-community-based services (HCBS). Employees with experience (level to be defined) can test out over a specified period of time, e.g. one year, or complete training while working.

*B. Format and nature of training or certificate*

- Qualifications should be established for individual workers, not agencies or training programs.
- All State agencies should be supportive of any requirements to be put in place, in order to ensure uniform implementation.
- If state-wide implementation of the curriculum is a goal, then the needs of rural areas must be considered in the planning process.
- The National Alliance for Direct Support Professionals (NADSP) has a credentialing program for direct support professionals that can provide guidance.
- Opinions were divided on the extent of training required before new employees start working. Some members suggested that the content of the core curriculum plus one module should be a prerequisite to work. Others felt that a shorter basic module in addition to First Aid/CPR and the employee orientation should be required, allowing individuals to start working and gain practical experience to help round out qualifications. However, there was agreement that training in fundamentals should be required of new employees before they have any contact with clients.

*Recommendation 2:* A subcommittee should prepare a recommendation for the parameters of the training program, including tiers of certification and a timeframe. The subcommittee should consider overall competencies, comprising theory and practical skills, plus an experiential component, such as an internship or supervised on-the-job experience of 90 days or more. Also, the extent of the initial training to be required of new employees (which may be less than what is required for certification) needs to be determined.

### *C. Delivery of training*

- There is a need to have options when implementing the curriculum; competencies should be defined and an assessment tool developed.
- A number of training materials exist that should be considered. Several agencies have their own curricula and materials or use training materials from other organizations, such as the College of Direct Support.
- Different delivery options for training are needed, possibly including community college courses, web-based training, hybrid courses, traveling instructors, and on-the-job training under the guidance of experienced professionals.
- There should be an option to test out of the theory and practical skills. Tests in languages other than English may need to be developed.
- The community colleges need support so that it is economically feasible for them to offer courses for direct care professionals. If training is offered within agencies, courses at the colleges may not attract the needed number of participants.

*Recommendation 3:* A subcommittee should pursue the discussion of delivery methods and instruments for the assessment of theoretical and practical knowledge.

## **II. Objectives for 2007-08**

The following options were discussed as possible objectives:

- Continue implementation of the curriculum through workshops for trainers and dissemination of material.
- Continue ongoing efforts in Maricopa and Pima counties.
- Engage in data collection and evaluation of ongoing efforts to determine how the training is making a difference.
- A pilot program in a rural area should be considered.
- Encourage discussion at the State agency level to support training and credentials across the agencies and the State.

*Recommendation 4:* DES should consider funding the following in fiscal year 2008:

1. Pilot the curriculum in a rural area.
2. Continue training activities and evaluation in Maricopa and Pima.

*Recommendation 5:* Subcommittees should be formed for the implementation of recommendations 2, 3, and 4.

### **III. Curriculum Committee**

- The Committee should continue with its focus on the curriculum.
- Subcommittees should address the specific issues and recommendations identified.
- The Committee is willing to discuss broader policy issues if requested by the Interagency Council on Long-Term Care.

*Recommendation 6:* Advise the Interagency Council on Long-Term Care that a public policy plan is needed in order to maintain a professional and competent direct care workforce in Arizona that will meet growing demand.

Summary prepared by Jutta Ulrich, incorporating feedback submitted by the facilitator, Karen Kurtz.

**Strategic Planning Meeting May 24, 2007  
Core Curriculum and Expansion Committee**

**Organizations Represented**

**Providers**

ABIL – Arizona Bridge to Independent Living  
AIRES  
CPES – Community Provider of Enrichment Services, Inc.  
Creative Networks  
Cypress Homecare Solutions LLC  
Foundation for Senior Living  
Home Instead  
SOREO In Home Support Services LLC  
United Cerebral Palsy of Southern Arizona  
Valley of the Sun School

**Educational Institutions**

Arizona Western College  
Phoenix College  
Pima Community College

**Community-based / Advocacy Groups**

Alzheimer's Association, Desert Southwest Chapter  
Area Agency on Aging, Region One  
Arizona Health Care Association  
Children and Family Alliance  
National Family Caregivers Association  
Valley Interfaith Project

**Governmental Organizations**

Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES)  
    Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS)  
    Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD)  
Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS)  
Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS)  
Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities  
Office of the Governor

**Strategic Planning Meeting May 24, 2007  
Core Curriculum and Expansion Committee**

**Attendance**

Averill, Karla, Office of the Governor  
Baxter, Bob, Cypress Homecare Solutions, LLC  
Besst, David, ADES-DAAS  
Critchfield, Rex, ADES-DAAS  
Danowski, Bonnie, National Family Caregivers Association  
Dean, Gwen, ABIL  
Durbin, John, Alzheimer's Association, Central Arizona Region  
Greiner, Molly, ADES –DDD  
Horne, Alicia, Valley of the Sun School  
Jensen, Sherri, SOREO  
Johnson, Dara, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities  
Jones, Ida, Creative Networks  
Ketterer, Wendy, AIRES  
Knaut, Jim, Area Agency on Aging, Region One  
LaBrie, Lynn, Arizona Western College  
Larson, Lynn, ADES-DAAS  
LeFevre, Diane, Children and Family Alliance, Parent Leader  
Martin, Linda, Foundation for Senior Living  
Miller, Staci, United Cerebral Palsy of Southern Arizona  
O'Connor, CJ, Area Agency on Aging, Region One  
Oppenheim, Alan, ADHS  
Pagels, Kathleen Collins, Arizona Health Care Association  
Pangrazio, Phil, ABIL  
Parker, Veronique, Phoenix College  
Roth, Bob, Cypress Homecare Solutions, LLC  
Roush, Ted, Pima Community College  
Schafer, Alan, AHCCCS  
Seplow, Debbie, Home Instead  
Sokol, Wendy, SOREO  
Starns, Melanie, Office of the Governor  
Toussaint, Diana, ADES-DAAS  
Ulrich, Jutta, ADES-DAAS  
White, Richard, Valley Interfaith Project  
Wilson, Rebekah, Alzheimer's Association, Central Arizona Region  
Young, Ruth, CPES

Karen Kurtz, Linda Cannon & Associates, facilitator  
Tamu Adams, ADES-DAAS, secretary